



COXHEATH PRIMARY SCHOOL

PUBLIC MINUTES OF THE 2023/2024 MEETING OF THE LOCAL GOVERNING BODY HELD ON TUESDAY 13th MAY 2025

Governors present at the meeting held on 8th July 2025 approved these minutes as a true and accurate record, and signed on Governor Hub electronically

PRESENT

Caroline Jacques (CJ) (Parent Governor) CHAIR	Jade Sheppard (JS) (Parent Governor)
Giacomo Mazza (GM) (Governor / Headteacher)	Claire Webb (co-opted governor)
Simon Malone (Parent Governor)	Katherine Tunnicliffe (Associate Governor)
Bev Evenden (BE) (Associate Governor / Deputy Headteacher)	Darren Flisher (Staff Governor / Assistant Headteacher)

IN ATTENDANCE

Andy Lacey (Governance Professional)	
--------------------------------------	--

PART A – PUBLIC MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Welcome:** CJ welcomed all parties to the meeting. CJ informed governors that a new co-opted governor, Hannah Juden had been appointed but which was only confirmed by Trustees last week, and who was unable to attend the meeting.
- 1.2 Apologies:** Apologies were received from Hannah Juden.
- 1.3 Quorum:** The meeting was confirmed as quorate throughout

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1** Governors were given the opportunity to declare any interests against the agenda to which none were declared. There were no updates to declarations.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND ACTIONS OUTSTANDING

- 3.1 Approval of Minutes:** Governors approved the public and confidential minutes presented as a true and accurate reflection of the meeting that took place on the 18th March 2025.

Action: AL to arrange for minutes as to be marked signed on Governor Hub and arrange for publication.

3.2 Matter arising from the minutes and review of actions

Actions from the previous meeting not included as a specific agenda item:

- **Contract for bikes** – DF informed governors that he had a list of people interested in loaning the bikes. There were a few administrative issues to resolve as well as finalising the insurance cover.
- **Future Leadership structure** – GM informed governors that the proposal for 25/26 had been discussed with MC and included for in the draft 25/26 budget.
- **Cyber security training** - SM provided AL with evidence of completing the cyber security training to complete the record.
- **Governor monitoring reports** – the writing monitoring report has been uploaded to Gov Hub.

4. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

4.1 There were no items raised.

5. SCHOOL STRATEGIC MATTERS

5.1 Strategic Document / School Improvement Plan (SIP)

GM provided a summary of the SiP saying that it provided governors with an impact assessment of the actions being taken, and included new actions where required.

In summary:

- Phonics – due to the positive impact of interventions such use of focus groups and ‘sounds right’, phonics is on track to achieve national average.
- Writing – Helen (Subject Lead) is planning to review the new writing framework with teachers during T5 to ascertain what has worked, what has not worked and modifications needed for 2025/26.
- Reading – Rachel (Subject Lead) has used PDM’s to model what and how the reading curriculum should be delivered in PDM’s, and in particular guided reading such as what to read to ensure pupils are exposed to a mix of texts.

5.2 Headteacher’s Report – verbal update

5.1.1 Behaviour and Attitudes

GM is reviewing the current behaviour ladder for Years 5 and 6 and questioned whether the secondary school model should be adopted. CW provided an overview of the secondary school behaviour process. BE expressed a view that pupils like to be recognised for good behaviour and be rewarded for such. GM had asked pupils if the offer of rewards for good behaviour offered encouragement to which a lot said ‘yes’. However, about 30% of pupils said ‘no’ as the chance of winning a prize was low, and / or they did not like the prizes. An alternative reward system is being explored for next year.

KT asked what was the feedback from School Council? The response was that prizes needed to be age appropriate, different year groups look at the recognition and reward process differently. CW said that in secondary schools, pupils received points and ultimately a HT award in recognition of their good behaviour.

KT asked if golden time was still being used? GM said that it had faded out due to the challenge of finding the time to fit it into the school day.

CJ commented that from her observations, DB seemed to have a good approach to managing behaviour. GM said that all teachers have their own approach depending on the class but this is underpinned by the behaviour policy.

5.1.2 SEND – Year 3 provision

DF informed governors that Year 3 remained a challenging group and as a result, a provision has been setup for the teaching of reading and phonics, writing and maths with focus groups to address foundational skills/knowledge. Possible tweaks to the delivery of T&L for Maths is being discussed with the Maths Lead.

CJ asked what has been the impact on the other Year 3 pupils? GM said that it was too early to say but staff have commented about the positive impact. DF advised governors that data was being tracked to monitor the impact, which he will share on Governor Hub.

ACTION: DF to provide data for uploading to Gov Hub.

CJ asked if the SEND register is up to date? DF said it was, and that the number was around the national average. Actual figures as provided by DF are:

SEND Support: School 14.4% National 14.1%

EHCP’s: School 1.3% National 3.0%

Combined: School 15.7% National 17.1%

CJ asked if CPS had identified all pupils that should be on the SEND register, and therefore had a clear baseline from which to move forward? DF confirmed all had been identified but needed to add the Year 3 pupils within the provision.

ACTION: DF to ensure SEND register complete and includes Yr 3 pupils within the provision.

CJ asked how did CPS compare to the other schools in relation to SEND? DF advised that LPS was 10.9% and StK was 18.7%.

5.1.5 Staffing

SEE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES.

5.2 Governor Monitoring

5.2.1 SEND Monitoring.

JS provided governors with a summary of her monitoring report, noting that there were few recommendations as she found the school is doing what it said it would do. The recommendations were:

- Review Membership of Student Council. JS found that there were no SEND pupils on the School Council. Pupils on the School Council were voted for by their class, and expected to 'make a case' for their election, which some SEND pupils might not feel comfortable doing. It was agreed that there should be two pupils from each class, one voted for by the class and a second put forward by the class teacher.
- Set aside a meeting space for SEND meetings. GM acknowledged this was a challenge as there is limited space but that it should improve with the new modular building.
- Clarification on future HNF funding arrangements and impact. DF said that the future arrangements were still to be confirmed but that the Trust had an advantage in that both HT LPS and MC (CEO) were chairs of a Community Funding Group. As reported, schools HNF will be protected for next year so they receive 75% of the current year allocation. The move to the model will happen for 26/27 when the situation is still to be confirmed but it is likely to require schools to submit annual bids for each and any pupil to receive HNF. Children with a EHC plan will have their funding guaranteed for next year and will move to a tariff model the following year. The funding for this model has not been shared.
- SEE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES.

5.3 Spring Data

BE provided governors with a detailed explanation of the spring data outcomes and expected out-turn referring to the documents provided to the meeting.

5.3.1 Reading

BE highlighted a key difference between the school report and Trust figures, which is due to teachers relying on their pupil assessments whereas the Trust focuses on test data. As a result, there is often a disparity between the two.

The highlights were:

- Year 2. The variance between teacher assessment and test outcome is due to testing being considered as generous and that teacher assessments are considered to be more accurate.
- Year 3. GM asked if the figures reported were reflective of the provision? BE said that if the provision was excluded then there would be an improvement in the figures.
- Year 5. GM said that the spring test results for reading were below expected. CW asked if pupils had done the same test? BE said that the test was similar so those working at GD should have been the same, and that they are looking into what might be the reason(s) for the reduction e.g. is it related to the amount of time providing guided reading to pupils?
- Year 6. Pupils sat the 2024 SATS test and the * represents missing data due to some not sitting the test due to absence or working below.

5.3.2 Maths

In summary, maths test results tend to be accurate as the curriculum and testing are both based on White Rose. SM asked why is there a disparity between teacher assessments and test outcomes? GM said that on occasions it was due to teachers being over cautious, and who tend to be reflective in their assessment. SM asked if there was a risk that those pupils assessed by teachers at working below when test result were higher might be attending focus groups were there was no need to do so? BE said that this would be picked up via pupil progress meetings which are regular meetings to discuss individual pupils progress rather than the group.

The key highlights were:

- Year 3 data reflected the situation in that 15 pupils were being taught maths in the provision as were working below national.
- GM was concerned with the Year 5 outcomes especially if this is reflected in their SATS results next year, which will be below national. BE said that there are several 'cuspy' children who are close to the boundary, and who with extra teaching and support through focus groups should achieve expected, which would hopefully be seen in the summer data outcomes.

GM informed governors that Ofsted were not interested purely in data as questioned the validity of such. SM asked why do the schools look at data if it is unreliable? GM said it was necessary to track progress.

5.3.3 Writing

BE said that teacher assessments for writing tended to be similar so the outcomes are as expected. SM asked how are teacher assessments challenged? GM said that it can be difficult to differentiate between boundary grades, but that there are moderation discussions across the trust and with the LEA to review teacher assessments.

BE advised that the summer data would be more accurate as pupils would have completed the learning.

5.3.4 Year 6 data

BE said it was encouraging to see the improvement in both reading and maths when comparing the spring data to the autumn data. It was however, a close call as to whether national would be achieved although the Maths Lead was confident 78% is realistic.

5.4 ECG Feedback

As CPS were not represented at the T5 ECG meeting, CJ asked AL to feedback on the key discussions.

Actions for LGB reps arising from ECG were:

- Suspensions. Why did there appear to be repeat suspensions at some of the schools? Although not directed towards CPS, GM advised that CPS did have a few pupils with multiple suspension, which is due to them not learning that their behaviour is unacceptable.
- Governor training. It was noted that the development of governor induction and training was ongoing. In addition, once the new Ofsted format had been confirmed, the Trust will arrange for governors to receive training in the new scheme.
- Improving communications with parents mainly in regards to better knowledge of what their children are being taught and how they are doing. GM advised that parent workshops have been offered but are poorly attended.

5.5 Parent Survey

GM provided governors with a summary of the parent survey outcomes, saying there had been a good level of response and feedback was generally positive. The key points to note:

- Parents generally feel their children are happy at the school (95% strongly agree / agree), 93% considered their children to be safe at the school and 96% thought their children did.
- GM was disappointed with the feedback concerning pastoral care as this shows it is not good enough. This will be followed up as there is a need to better understand the feedback and action to improve.
- Parental the demand for more clubs will be discussed at Parent Council to address the feedback, and develop a way forward.

6. SCHOOL SPECIFIC POLICIES

There were no policies to share at this meeting.

7. FINANCE UPDATE

GM informed governors that the April management accounts were now available. The April 2025 figures reported a more positive out-turn as reflected the recent internal appointment to the DHT position effective from September 2025, and the new structure for 2025/26, which resulted in savings.

SEE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES.

In addition, GM reported that the unspent 2024/25 curriculum budgets had been frozen. The budgets were for current year teaching resources, and given they had not been purchased then he had questioned whether or not they were actually required. Any proposal to spend the remaining curriculum budget would require his approval to avoid unnecessary spend.

8. SAFEGUARDING AND ACCESSIBILITY MATTERS

8.1 Safeguarding including LADO

GM informed governors that the Trust Estates Manager carried out the H&S audits with the Site Manager (report provided), and there were no significant H&S matters to report.

CJ asked who actions the works identified and addresses any concerns raised? GM advised that the Site Manager was responsible for actioning, and resolving the issues.

There were no LADO referrals to report.

8.2 Risk Assessment / Registers

GM referred governors to the school risk register saying that the three HT's had worked together to produce their respective registers. The document followed the Trust template and identified risks, which had been evaluated with mitigations. Governors noted the risks and that they were being managed.

9. TRUST MATTERS

9.1 The minutes of the Trust Board meeting held on 26th March 2025 were included with the papers. There were no matters to be reported to the Trustees.

10. TRUST POLICIES

10.1 Governors noted that a Trust Communications Policy had been adopted. That the Staff Code of Conduct had been updated, and the changes were being reflected in a revised Governor Code of Conduct, which trustees would receive in T6.

11. ANY OTHER GOVERNOR MATTERS

11.1 There were no other matters raised.

12. MEETING CLOSE

12.1 Confidentiality: Governors confirmed that 5.1.5, 5.2.1 (part) and 7 (part) would be recorded as confidential.

12.2. Next meeting date: All to be held at Coxheath Primary School commencing at 1700 on:

- Tuesday 8th July 2025

Governance calendar on Governor Hub

12.3 Meeting close: CJ thanked all attendees for their contribution to the meeting. The meeting closed at 1910.